

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 9-13, 18, 19, 21, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Iwakabe et al. (US 2002/0004108).

Claims 23-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sung (US 5,978,058).

Claims 14-17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwakabe et al. in view of Applicants' Related Art FIGs. 1-3 and Chowdhury (US 6,268,289).

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Title of the Invention is objected to for allegedly not being descriptive.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended the Title of the Invention, and amended claims 9, 12, and 23 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-26 are pending for further consideration, with claims 1-8 having been withdrawn from consideration.

Objection to the Title of the Invention

The Title of the Invention is objected to for allegedly not being descriptive. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the Title of the Invention to recite "METHOD OF FABRICATING CONTACT LINE OF LIQUID CRYSTAL DISPLAY DEVICE." Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the Title, as presently amended, is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed, and respectfully request that the objection to the Title be withdrawn.

All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, claim 12 is allegedly confusing. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claim 12 to recite “wherein the step of forming the silicide layer is performed *before* the step of forming an insulating layer.” Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12 particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention, and respectfully request that the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 9-13, 18, 19, 21, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Iwakabe et al. (US 2002/0004108), claims 23-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sung (US 5,978,058), and claims 14-17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwakabe et al. in view of Applicants’ Related Art FIGs. 1-3 and Chowdhury (US 6,268,289).

Independent claim 9, as amended, recites a method of fabricating a contact line structure for a liquid crystal display device including, in part, a step of “forming a silicide layer on at least a first surface portion of the metal line.” Similarly, independent claim 23, as amended recites a method of fabricating a contact line structure for a liquid crystal display device including, in part, a step of “forming a silicide layer on the first surface portion of the metal line exposed by the contact hole.”

In contrast to Applicants’ claimed invention, Iwakabe et al. teaches, in FIG. 3, for example, forming a silicide layer SD1(d1) on a surface of a passivation layer PSV. Accordingly,

Applicants respectfully assert that Iwakabe et al. is completely silent with regard to a method including, at least, a step of “forming a silicide layer on at least a first surface portion of the metal line,” as recited by amended independent claim 9, and hence dependent claims 10-22.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that Iwakabe et al. is completely silent with regard to a method including, at least, a step of “forming a silicide layer on the first surface portion of the metal line exposed by the contact hole,” as recited by amended independent claim 23, and hence dependent claims 24-26.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action fails to rely upon any of Sung, Applicants’ Related Art FIGs. 1-3, and Chowdhury to remedy the deficiencies of Iwakabe et al. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that none of Sung, Applicants’ Related Art FIGs. 1-3, and Chowdhury can remedy the deficiencies of Iwakabe et al.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 (b), 102(e), and 103(a) should be withdrawn because none of Iwakabe et al., Sung, Applicants’ Related Art FIGs. 1-3, and Chowdhury, whether taken singly or combined, teaches or suggests the novel combination of features recited by amended independent claims 9 and 23, and hence dependent claims 10-22 and 24-26.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 
David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: February 7, 2005

CUSTOMER NO. 09629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 739-3000